IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.RAMKUMAR

WEDNESDAY, THE 31ST OCTOBER 2007 / 9TH KARTHIKA 1929

Crl.Rev.Pet.No. 543 of 2004(C)

CC.705/1995 of JUDL. MAGISTRATE OF FIRST CLASS COURT, PARAPPANANGADI

CRA.333/2002 of SESSIONS COURT, MANJERI

.....

REVN. PETITIONER: APPELLANT/ACCUSED:

RASIA BEEVI, W/O. SAFFARULLA,
MANAGING DIRECTOR, ULLAS TRAVELS,
NIZA BUILDING, P.B.NO.16, ATTINGAL,
NEAR POST OFFICE, ATTINGAL.

BY ADV. SRI.P.B.ASOKAN
SRI.SHERRY J. THOMAS
SRI.T.J.THOMAS (ALUVA)

RESPONDENTS: RESPONDENTS/COMPLAINANTS:

---

1. MR. ABDU, S/O. MOHAMMEDALI,
CHERKAT HOUSE, NEDUVA AMSOM, DESOM,
TIRURANGADI TALUK, PARAPPANANGADI POLICE
STATION LIMITS.

2. STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY
THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, HIGH COURT OF KERALA,
ERNAKULAM.

BY ADV. SRI.S.V.BALAKRISHNA IYER
SRI.HARISH R. MENON
PUBLIC PROSECUTOR SRI.K.S.SIVAKUMAR

THIS CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 31/10/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

V. RAMKUMAR, J.

Crl. R.P. No. 543 OF 2004

Dated this the 31st day of October, 2007

O R D E R

In this revision filed under Section 397 read with Section 401 Cr.P.C. the petitioner who was the accused in C.C. No.705/1995 on the file of the J.F.C.M., Parappanangadi challenges the conviction entered and the sentence passed against her for an offence punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act').

2. I heard the learned counsel for the revision petitioner and the learned Public Prosecutor.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the revision petitioner re-iterated the contentions in support of the revision. The courts below have concurrently held that the cheque in question was drawn by the revision petitioner in favour of the complainant on the drawee bank, that the cheque was validly presented to the bank, that it was dishonoured for reasons which fall under Section 138 of the Act, that the complainant made a demand for payment by a notice in time in accordance with clause (b) of the proviso to Section 138 of the Act and that the revision

petitioner/accused failed to make the payment within 15 days of receipt of the statutory notice. Both the courts have considered and rejected the defence set up by the revision petitioner while entering the above finding. The said finding has been recorded on an appreciation of the oral and documentary evidence. I do not find any error, illegality or impropriety in the finding so recorded concurrently by the courts below. The conviction was thus rightly entered against the petitioner.

4. What now survives for consideration is the question as to whether a proper sentence has been imposed on the revision petitioner. I am, however, inclined to modify the sentence in the light of the recent pronouncement by the Supreme Court that no default sentence can be imposed for an order for compensation under Section 357(3) Cr.P.C. Accordingly, the sentence imposed by the courts below on the revision petitioner is set aside and instead she is sentenced to pay a fine of Rs.80,000/- (Rupees eighty thousand only) [giving credit to the sum of Rs.40,000/- (Rupees forty thousand only) deposited by the revision petitioner before the trial court pursuant to the interim order passed by the lower appellate court and which amount shall be allowed to be withdrawn by the 1st respondent complainant] within four months

from today, failing which she shall suffer simple imprisonment for three months by way of default sentence. As and when the fine amount is deposited, the same shall be paid to the 1st respondent complainant by way of compensation under Section 357(1) Cr.P.C.

This revision is disposed of confirming the conviction but modifying the sentence as above.

(V. RAMKUMAR, JUDGE)

aks